

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ AJRCS _99323</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Use of medicinal plants in the alternative treatment of breast cancer</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journalajrcs.com/index.php/AJRCS/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. Yes, it will be an added knowledge in the area of cancer research.</p> <p>2. An alternative title is suggested, "Knowledge on the use of medicinal plants for alleviation of cancer symptoms: a semi-structured survey". The researcher used survey tool to identify the medicinal plants used by respondents in alleviation the symptoms of cancer disease but not directly treating the cancer cells, therefore it is important to mention this in the title for better understanding of the reader.</p> <p>3. The abstract is well written.</p> <p>4. The Introduction is well written however in the methodology there are some clarifications needed for better understanding of the reader. For instance, how did you choose your respondents? Are there criteria involved? What is the statistical tool used for number of respondents needed in the study? What happened to the data if the respondent did not answer all the questions, etc. For the survey tool, is it a validated tool? For ethics, the researcher mentioned an informed consent was given. May I ask if the study have an approval from human research ethics committee of the institution prior to the conduct of the study? In the results and discussion part there are confusing areas. For instance, the researcher mentioned a total of 54 respondents and in the discussion the participants cited 136 medicinal plants in the treatment of cancer. Why the citation does not corresponds to the number of participants? Also, be careful in using the word "treatment for cancer", based on my understanding in the paper, the used of medicinal plants by respondents is to alleviate the symptoms not treating the cancer disease. Another blurred area is the use of breast cancer word. In the results of the survey as quoted from the manuscript " <b>When asked if they had any type of chronic disease, 77.8% said they did not have it and 22.2% had some type of chronic disease, among which diabetes, hypertension, bronchitis, lupus and chronic sinusitis stood out</b>". Breast cancer did not come out in the respondents' answers. However, in the whole manuscript, the researcher keeps on using the word breast cancer.</p> <p>5. There are some confusing statements in the manuscript kindly clarify for better understanding of our reader.</p> <p>6. References are correctly written.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anna Muriel T. Jacinto
Department, University & Country	Industrial Technology Development Institute, Philippines